

10891/P01/AGS/IBSS/LP

PATENTS

R E M A R K S

- Claims 1 to 8, 10 to 36, 38 to 41, 43 to 49, 51 to 93, 95 to 97, 99 to 108 and 110 to 117 are pending
- Claims 1, 32, 73, 93, 105, 114, & 116 have been amended herein

Claim 114 has been amended herein to correct a minor typographical error. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Provisional Obviousness Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has maintained the provisional obviousness double patenting rejection of Claims 1, 2, 32, 37 to 39, 73, 78, 81, 93, 94, 98 to 100, 105, 106, and 109 over Claims 28 and 40 of co-pending Application No. 10/627,416. Applicants respectfully request that the provisional rejection continue to be held in abeyance until other outstanding rejections are overcome.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 116 and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, both First and Second Paragraphs based on the use of the term "consisting essentially of." Applicants have amended Claim 116 herein to clarify that a solution "including at least 5% but less than 50% hydrochloric acid by weight" is claimed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejections of Claims 116 and 117 be withdrawn.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 29 to 31, 93, 98, 103 to 105, 109, 114, 116, and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as

10891/P01/AGS/IBSS/LP

PATENTS

unpatentable over Datta (U.S. Patent No. 5,152,878). Claims 2, 32, 36, 37, 40 to 50, 67 to 72, 94, and 106 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Datta in view of JP11-290805. Claims 3 to 28, 33 to 35, 38, 39, 51 to 66, 73 to 81, 95 to 97, 99 to 102, 107, 108, 110 to 113, and 115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Datta in view of JP11-290805 and in further view of Spring (Metal Cleaning, Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1963, pages 83 to 89). Claims 116 and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Cathey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,853,492).

Applicants respectfully assert that as amended herein, Claims 1, 29 to 31, 93, 98, 103 to 105, 109, 114, 116, and 117 are not obvious in light of Datta; Claims 2, 32, 36, 37, 40 to 50, 67 to 72, 94, and 106 are not obvious in light of Datta and JP11-290805; Claims 3 to 28, 33 to 35, 38, 39, 51 to 66, 73 to 81, 95 to 97, 99 to 102, 107, 108, 110 to 113, and 115 are not obvious in light of Datta, JP11-290805, and Spring; and Claims 116 and 117 not obvious in light of Cathey.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 32, 93, 105, and 116 to make explicit that which was previously implicit, namely that the recited method of cleaning a molybdenum mask is performed using only a single aqueous cleaning solution including hydrochloric acid. Claim 73 has been amended to recite placing a container containing a mask in only a single cleaning solution. Thus, Applicants claims as amended only use a single solution and a single chemical treatment/placement. As noted in Applicants' prior response, Datta discloses a method that involves multiple solutions and multiple steps. Likewise, Cathey does not disclose cleaning a molybdenum mask is performed using only a single aqueous

10891/P01/AGS/IBSS/LP

PATENTS

cleaning solution including hydrochloric acid. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections based on either Datta or Cathey.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe all of the claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney should any issues remain.

A request for a three month extension of time is being submitted herewith along with the requisite fee. No other fees are believed necessary, however, if any additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

Respectfully Submitted,



Brian M. Dugan, Esq.
Registration No. 41,720
Dugan & Dugan, PC
Attorneys for Applicants
(914) 332-9081

Dated: April 4, 2006
Tarrytown, New York